U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

B5

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

[redacted]

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: [redacted] Office: Texas Service Center Date: JAN 11 2002

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(2)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:
This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

[redacted]

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks classification pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(2), as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The petitioner seeks employment as an engineer. The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner qualifies for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that the petitioner had not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

Section 203(b) of the Act states in pertinent part that:

> (2) Aliens Who Are Members of the Professions Holding Advanced Degrees or Aliens of Exceptional Ability. --
>
> > (A) In General. -- Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.
> >
> > (B) Waiver of Job Offer. -- The Attorney General may, when he deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) that an alien's services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

The petitioner holds an M.S. degree in Engineering from the University of Texas at Austin. The petitioner's occupation falls within the pertinent regulatory definition of a profession. The petitioner thus qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The sole issue in contention is whether the petitioner has established that a waiver of the job offer requirement, and thus a labor certification, is in the national interest.

Neither the statute nor Service regulations define the term "national interest." Additionally, Congress did not provide a specific definition of "in the national interest." The Committee on the Judiciary merely noted in its report to the Senate that the committee had "focused on national interest by increasing the

number and proportion of visas for immigrants who would benefit the United States economically and otherwise. . . ." S. Rep. No. 55, 101st Cong., 1st Sess., 11 (1989).

Supplementary information to Service regulations implementing the Immigration Act of 1990 (IMMACT), published at 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991), states:

> The Service believes it appropriate to leave the application of this test as flexible as possible, although clearly an alien seeking to meet the [national interest] standard must make a showing significantly above that necessary to prove the "prospective national benefit" [required of aliens seeking to qualify as "exceptional."] The burden will rest with the alien to establish that exemption from, or waiver of, the job offer will be in the national interest. Each case is to be judged on its own merits.

It must be noted that, while the national interest waiver hinges on prospective national benefit, it clearly must be established that the alien's past record justifies projections of future benefit to the national interest. The petitioner's subjective assurance that the alien will, in the future, serve the national interest cannot suffice to establish prospective national benefit. The inclusion of the term "prospective" is used here to require future contributions by the alien, rather than to facilitate the entry of an alien with no demonstrable prior achievements, and whose benefit to the national interest would thus be entirely speculative.

The petitioner's initial submission consisted of a certificate of incorporation for his company, Advanced Imageware Solutions, Inc., and documentation pertaining to the petitioner's education, grant proposals, and memberships in professional associations. The petitioner describes his work as "[d]esigning and training of neurocontroller for application on various non-linear plants."

The director denied the petition, stating that the petitioner has not submitted evidence that would set him apart from other engineers in his specialty, and thereby demonstrate that the petitioner qualifies for the special added benefit of a national interest waiver.

On appeal, the petitioner states that he "will be employed by Engineering Mechanics Research Corporation." The petitioner submits various documents, including a brochure from Engineering Mechanics Research Corporation. This brochure establishes the nature of the products generated by that company, but it does not establish that the petitioner will serve the national interest by working for the company. The petitioner also submits copies of scholarly articles about computer image processing. The petitioner did not write any of these articles, nor has he explained how they

[redacted]

are significant to him in particular (rather than his occupation in general).

We note that the initial filing contained no mention of Engineering Mechanics Research Corporation; rather, the petitioner indicated at that time that he would be employed by his own company. The petitioner's subsequent efforts to secure employment through another company cannot retroactively establish eligibility for a waiver of the statutory job offer requirement. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition that has already been filed in an effort to make an apparently deficient petition conform to Service requirements. See Matter of Izumii, I.D. 3360 (Assoc. Comm., Examinations, July 13, 1998), and Matter of Katigbak, 14 I&N Dec. 45 (Reg. Comm. 1971), in which the Service held that beneficiaries seeking employment-based immigrant classification must possess the necessary qualifications as of the filing date of the visa petition.

Donald McCurdy, executive vice-president of Greater Austin Transportation Company (which operates several hundred taxicabs and other private vehicles), states in a letter:

> This letter is written . . . [to] assist [the petitioner] in determining the contributions of optical flow and neural integration, in steering and braking systems, in traffic collisions. The requirements for this design is [sic] not only exceedingly complex scientific image processing and optical flow computations but also requires the neural network trainer to be thoroughly experienced in professional driving. I can verify that [the petitioner] has attained competency at the level of professional driving.

Mr. McCurdy asserts that his company "would be happy to participate in any study dedicated to increasing the safety of automobiles," but the petitioner's very involvement in such a study does not inherently qualify him for a national interest waiver. There are countless engineers and researchers in the United States whose fundamental duties involve traffic safety, product safety, and so on. Work in a safety-related field does not inherently qualify an alien engineer for a national interest waiver. While we do not dispute the overall importance of the petitioner's field of endeavor, the petitioner has not explained how he stands to benefit the U.S. to a greater degree than would a fully qualified U.S. worker in the same capacity. Neither the statute nor the regulations establish a blanket waiver for all workers in the petitioner's field.[1]

---

[1]While the statute does provide for what amounts to a blanket waiver for certain physicians, the fact that such physicians are singled out for a blanket waiver underscores the absence of blanket

[redacted]

As is clear from a plain reading of the statute, it was not the intent of Congress that every person qualified to engage in a profession in the United States should be exempt from the requirement of a job offer based on national interest. Likewise, it does not appear to have been the intent of Congress to grant national interest waivers on the basis of the overall importance of a given profession, rather than on the merits of the individual alien. On the basis of the evidence submitted, the petitioner has not established that a waiver of the requirement of an approved labor certification will be in the national interest of the United States.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

This denial is without prejudice to the filing of a new petition by a United States employer accompanied by a labor certification issued by the Department of Labor, appropriate supporting evidence and fee.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

---

waivers for workers in other occupations. If the original statute implied the existence of blanket waivers, then the provision pertaining to physicians would be redundant.